United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

	.						
Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge		Milton	I. Shadur	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge			
CASE NUMBER		04 C	2685	DATE	7/20	/2004	
CASE TITLE		USA vs. Andrew Traeger					
МО	TION:	[In the following box (a of the motion being pro) indicate the party filing the esented.]	ne motion, e.g., plaintiff, def	endant, 3rd party plaintiff, an	d (b) state briefly the nature	
		•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
DO	CKET ENTRY:						
(1)	□ Filed	motion of [use listin	g in "Motion" box al	pove.]			
(2)	☐ Brief	ief in support of motion due					
(3)							
(4)							
(5)							
(6)	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at						
(7)							
(8)		ch/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at					
(9)	☐ This c	nis case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] FRCP4(m) Local Rule 41.1 FRCP41(a)(1) FRCP41(a)(2).					
(10)	order stands.	docket entry] Ente . Traeger's most i entirety. (12-1)	er Memorandum C recent motion, wh	Order. Accordingly ich effectively seek	the July 8 memorants a reconsideration	ndum opinion and of that opinion, is	
(11)	For f	urther detail see orde	r attached to the orig	inal minute order.]			
	No notices required, a	dvised in open court.				Document Number	
	No notices required.				suntage of in the state of the		
V	Notices mailed by judge's staff. Notified counsel by telephone.			•	JUL 4 P		
Docketing to mail notices.				date docketed	12		
	Mail AO 450 form.		TANOD TOIATS	Siu :s:u •	docketing deputy initials		
	Copy to judge/magistrate judge.		CLERK		7/20/2004		
sn		courtroom deputy's initials	SO by 3: r6		date mailed notice		

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)		
Plaintiff,)		
V.)	Case No:	04 C 2685
ANDREW TRAEGER,)		(97 CR 697)
Defendant.)		

MEMORANDUM ORDER

After the issuance of this Court's July 8, 2004 memorandum opinion and order denying the 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion that had been filed pro se by Andrew Traeger ("Traeger"), this Court received another pro se communication from Traeger that he has labeled as his Reply to the Government's Response to his motion. Traeger has concluded that most recent filing with a request for an evidentiary hearing and the appointment of counsel.

As the July 8 opinion reflected, the government's response to Traeger's motion demonstrated why no evidentiary hearing was required. And that being so, Rule 8(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2255 Proceedings for the United States District Court allowed the summary dismissal ordered by this Court. Traeger's current filing does not call for a different result.

It is true that Dr. Thomas Hare, whose affidavit this Court credited for purposes of its ruling, provided personal care to Traeger only during the more recent portions of his stay at the

12

Springfield, Missouri Medical Center. But as to the earlier portion of Traeger's confinement that had not been observed personally by Dr. Hare, the uncontroverted medical records from the institution also negated Traeger's claimed incompetence that assertedly precluded his timely preparation of a Section 2255 motion. In sum, nothing in Traeger's current filing calls for the rethinking of this Court's July ruling.

Accordingly the July 8 memorandum opinion and order stands. Traeger's most recent motion, which effectively seeks a reconsideration of that opinion, is denied in its entirety.

Milton I. Shadur

Senior United States District Judge

Jultan D Studen

Date: July 20, 2004